



FISH & NEAVE

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO	COMPANY/FIRM	RECIPIENT FAX	RECIPIENT PHONE
Examiner Idriss N. Alrobaye	United States Patent and Trademark Office	571.270.2023	571.270.1023

SENDER	DATE	SENDER'S FAX	SENDER'S PHONE
Gall Gotfried Patent Agent	April 10, 2008	212-596-9090	212.596.9472

CLIENT	RE:	TIME	PAGES (INCLUDING COVER)
000174.0248	Application No. 10/796,499 (174/248)		4

MESSAGE

Examiner Alrobaye:

As per our phone conversation, attached is a proposed agenda for discussion by telephone. As indicated on the attachment, this document is for discussion purposes only and is not for entry into the application.

This communication is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that the unauthorized dissemination of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone. If not completely received, please call back at 212.596.9090 as soon as possible.

1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, NY 10020 TEL 212.596.9000 FAX 212.596.9090
 525 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, PALO ALTO, CA 94301 TEL 650.617.4000 FAX 650.617.4090
 1899 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, WASHINGTON, DC 20006 TEL 202.303.2400 FAX 202.303.2400

**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT FOR ENTRY INTO APPLICATION**

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/796,499
Filed: March 8, 2004
Our Docket: 1/4/298

Parties:

USPTO: Examiner Idriss N. Alrobaye
Ropes & Gray: Gall C. Gotfried (Reg. No. 58,333)

PROPOSED TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION BY TELEPHONE

Claims 1 and 15

Claims 1 and 15 specify that a value at the input of each column is selectively routed to any register in that column by bypassing a register in the column.

The Examiner alleges that such an implementation is well-known in the art and cites Ema as showing this limitation. In particular, the Examiner states that one would recognize that the structure of registers and muxes shown in FIG. 14 of Ema is the same as the structure shown in FIG. 2 of applicant's specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees (Office Action, page 18).

As specified by claims 1 and 15, the value at the input of each column (e.g., the input value received by register 104a) is selectively routed to any register in that column (e.g., the same input value is received by each multiplexer coupled to each subsequent register in that column) by bypassing any register in the column (e.g., the value received by register 104a bypasses register 112a and is received by register 132a). In contrast, as shown and described in connection with FIG. 14 of Ema, each multiplexer in a column either receives the value from a previous register or a different value altogether. Nowhere in Ema do any of the multiplexers in the column receive the same value unlike applicant's claims which require a value at the input to be selectively routed to any register in the column by bypassing a register in the column.

**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT FOR ENTRY INTO APPLICATION**

Looking at the differences between the structure shown in applicant's FIG. 2 and that shown in FIG. 14 of Ema, it is evident that the two structures are distinguishable contrary to the Examiner's assertions. In particular, in applicant's structure each multiplexer receives, at the first input, a value from the same connection that is coupled to the first register 102a and, at the second input, the value from a previous register 122a. In contrast, the Ema structure shows each multiplexer being coupled to the same select signal and receiving, at one input, a value from a previous register and, at the second input, a value P13, P9, P5, etc. Clearly, the Ema structure is not the same as applicant's structure which has an input to the column coupled to each multiplexer in the column in order to route a value at the input to any register in the column, as specified by the claims.

The Examiner contends that in Ema, the LOAD1 signal is an input value that bypasses a register in the column (Office Action, pages 4 and 15). However, applicant respectfully submits that the LOAD1 signal in Ema is not a value at the input of the column that is selectively routed to any register in the column but is instead a select signal which is provided to each multiplexer in the Ema system to select a mode of operation (i.e., shifting or loading data) (Ema, page 4, ¶ 84). Furthermore, because the LOAD1 signal only selects an operation mode it is not received by any register in the column. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the LOAD1 signal necessarily cannot be selectively routed to any register in the column, as specified by applicant's claims 1 and 15.

**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT FOR ENTRY INTO APPLICATION**

Claims 22 and 24

Claims 22 and 24 specify that each of a first and second multiplexer is operative to select between a same first value and a different second value for application to a respective register.

The Examiner alleges that in Ema, the LOAD1 signal is equivalent to applicant's selection of a same first value (Office Action, pages 4 and 15). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As stated above, the LOAD1 signal in Ema is provided to each multiplexer in the Ema system to cause selection of a mode of operation (i.e., shifting or loading data) (Ema, page 4, ¶ 84). In particular, the multiplexers in the Ema system are not selecting between the LOAD1 signal and a different second value but are selecting between a value received from a previous register and some other value based on the LOAD1 signal. Thus, because the LOAD1 signal is the signal causing the multiplexers to perform a selection, it necessarily is not a same value being selected by the multiplexer as a value for application to a register, as specified by applicant's claims 22 and 24.

Moreover, the LOAD1 signal in Ema is only received by the multiplexers in the column (to select a mode) and is not received by any register in the column (Ema, page 4, ¶ 84). Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the LOAD1 signal necessarily cannot be selected by the multiplexer as a value for application to a register, as specified by applicant's claims 22 and 24.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, 22 and 24 and their respective dependent claims are allowable.